

Fairfax County Pre-Disaster Recovery Plan (PDRP)
PDRP Steering Committee Meeting no. 9
August 10, 2011; 3:00pm
MPSTOC, rm. 2104/2106

Attendees:

A. Welcome and (re)introductions

Ms. Phan began the meeting with an overview of the agenda and announcements. The attendees then provided a brief self introduction. Marc Barberie explained the Health Department's current effort to re-write their Emergency Operations Plan and other medical emergency response plans. Dave McKernan also announced the retirement of Mike Ryan, Deputy Coordinator of Office of Emergency Management (OEM). During this time Matthew Lyttle, Volunteer Fairfax, announced the upcoming Northern Virginia Volunteer Organizations Active in Disaster (VOAD) Meeting.

B. Updates

Ms. Phan announced to the group that she and Dave McKernan will meet Supervisor McKay in to discuss the PDRP. She also explained that they, with Marilyn McHugh, will meet with him in September regarding Continuity of Government (COG) planning. Ms. Phan stated that since the last steering committee meeting, a few meetings regarding intergovernmental coordination with some external partners have taken place. The purposes of these meetings were to ensure external partners are aware of the plan and that the PDRP is aligning with existing plans and procedures. Ms. Phan stated she presented at the Northern Virginia Emergency Response System (NVERS). The question that came up during the presentation was regarding the extent of involvement from the State. Ms. Phan explained to the group who had been involved from the State during the PDRP development process, including Mike McCalister, Homeland Security for the Governor's Office, as well as representatives from Virginia Department of Emergency Management (VDEM) Headquarters, VDEM Region 7, and FEMA.

Mr. Cohen provided an overview of the meetings with VDEM Region 7, VDEM Headquarters, FEMA Office of National Capital Coordination and the Recovery Directorate. He stated that he and Ms. Phan briefed them on our approach to intergovernmental coordination. The take away from the meeting was that the PDRP was structured appropriately and complied with current state and federal approach.

Ms. Phan began explaining to the committee the next item on the agenda, PDRP Phase 2, which will involve the pre-disaster tasks in the PDRP. She explained that phase 2 will focus on working on the economic recovery and recovery permit approvals process. She stated that this phase will not begin process until next spring. She also informed the committee that the Fairfax Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) revision is complete and online now. Mr. McKernan stated the EOP has also been approved by the Board of Supervisors and each agency is getting a hard copy, but you can also get it online.

Ms. Phan informed the committee that the Northern Virginia Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) has been completed. The man-made Hazard Identification Risk Analysis (HIRA) piece has also been completed. Ms. Phan explained that the OEM Planning section is reviewing the identified threats and considering plans which should be developed based on those findings.

Ms. Cohen stated that the planning team was waiting on the updated HMP and man-made HIRA to validate the PDRP development approach. The approach was validated. The HIRA noted that the only the hazards of most concern to cause a catastrophic disaster are in fact man-made and pandemic hazards. Natural hazards are far more unlikely to cause such an impact.

C. Review Previously Discussed Draft Plan Elements

Mr. Cohen stated that the edits to the Long Term Community Recovery annex been incorporated and the document is now on the Sharepoint site. The edits regarding the General and Command staff descriptions and intergovernmental coordination pieces that were reviewed have been made. The documents are not posted to the Sharepoint site yet. He explained that the planning team is still finalizing all the changes. Mr. Cohen described the crosswalk process to the committee. He explained the planning team did a full crosswalk of the PDRP against the FAIRFAX EOP, National Capital Region Regional Coordination Plan, the National Disaster Recovery Framework, and the Florida Post-Disaster Redevelopment Planning Guidelines to ensure all of the concepts which should be in this plan are there. Mr. Cohen then asked the group for any questions regarding this process.

D. Review New Draft Plan Elements

Mr. Cohen then began providing an overview of the Recovery Coordinator and Policy Advisory Board roles. He explained the planning team met with Supervisor McKay and the County Executive for input for developing these roles. Mr. Cohen stated that their input has been incorporated into the section which outlines the roles and responsibilities for these positions. Mr. Cohen then began to provide the committee with an overview of these sections to discuss any questions or concerns.

Mr. Cohen described the organizational structure of the Recovery Coordinator and how the position will be appointed. He provided an overview of the portion which describes the skill set of the Recovery Coordinator and why the document states the appointment of the Recovery Coordinator position cannot be part-time. The intention of the planning team was to leave the skill sets flexible.

He then described the role the Recovery Coordinator will fill according to the NDRF. The PDRP specified the Recovery Coordinator will serve as the equivalent of incident commander if there is some sort of unified command set up for recovery. Mr. Cohen stated that an annex to the plan consisting of checklists for higher level positions is currently in development. He explained there will be a checklist for the Recovery Coordinator position.

Mr. Cohen explained the role of the Recovery Policy Advisory Board. He explained the board is structured to operate like any other board or commission, compiling with County laws regarding commissions including open meeting laws and sunset laws, etc. He stated the Recovery Policy Board will be established for recovery only and not serve as a regional entity but, will represent the County of Fairfax only; it will serve as an ad hoc body not a standing body. Mr. Cohen described the board membership of 12 how they will be appointed. The Board of Supervisors is also authorized to appoint themselves to the Recovery Policy Board. Leslie Johnson, Planning and Zoning, stated that since the recovery board isn't authorized to spend funds, the Board of Supervisors would have to change 'hats'.

Mr. Cohen provided a description of the knowledge, skills, and abilities which members of the Advisory Board should possess, including geographic distribution and a variety of private and public sector members. He also explained the language stating preference should be given to those

who are already serving on existing boards within the County. This will ensure the expertise is there. He also provided an explanation of the PDRP language which states the required meeting schedule and how those meetings should be open to the public and media.

Ron Kirkpatrick, DPWES, stated his concern regarding the Board of Supervisors forming a committee. He asked if there has been discussion regarding establishing a timeline for making nominations for Recovery Policy Board members. He suggested incorporating language that would authorize the County Executive to determine a timeline for nominations to be submitted. Mr. Cohen stated he thought that was a viable option and that the planning team would consider incorporation of that concept in the PDRP

Matthew Lyttle, Volunteer Fairfax, asked if the PDRP Recovery Policy Board language included anything regarding the dissolution of the policy. He also asked if there a limit to how long the board can act. Mr. Cohen explained the sunset requirement. He stated the completion of the recovery mission is at the discretion of the County Executive. He also stated that language laying out term limits for board members may be advisable. Mr. McKernan suggested the paragraph regarding the consistency with other boards and commissions may provide an answer to Mr. Lyttle's question. Ms. McHugh stated each board, formed within the County, is different and has different by-laws.

Ms. Phan asked if the section included anything regarding by-laws. Mr. McKernan asked if the Steering Committee thought it would be comfortable allowing the Board of Supervisors to set the Recovery Policy Board by-laws. One attendee clarified, stating that someone from the County staff would be the Recovery Coordinator and the County Executive, whom the Recovery Policy Board would report, would provide the necessary oversight.

Ms. McHugh commented on the language regarding the authority of the Recovery Policy Board. She explained that the language states the board has overarching policy guidance and general prioritization for County recovery activities. If there is a major event (like Joplin) happens here. She is concerned with the Board of Supervisors allowing the Recovery Policy Board to make these decisions. She also commented on the fact that if the Board of Supervisors appoints themselves, it would defeat the purpose of the Recovery Policy Board.

Mr. Cohen stated that the Board of Supervisors can either take the recommendations of the Recovery Policy Board or not. If they don't they will have to explain why.

Ms. McHugh replied that the Recovery Policy Board reports directly to the Recovery Coordinator, they won't report to the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Cohen explained that the Board of Supervisors would still have authority over spending of funds. The Recovery Policy Board reports to the County Executive as well but there should also be a line to the Board of Supervisors as well.

Ms. McHugh made a comment regarding if all 10 board of supervisor members are not available there would be an issue of who appointed the Recovery Policy Board members. The COG plan includes emergency successors, which would serve for a temporary time until an election is held. Mr. Cohen explained that part of the assumptions is that there is a continuity of government plan.

Ms. McHugh stated she is thinking not just in terms of calling out that person, but also function. Ms. McHugh stated that the interim member of the Board of Supervisors or the County Executive to appoint Recovery Policy Board members, in place of the missing board member. Mr. Cohen agreed with the concept. Ms. Phan commented that would depend on the line of succession. Ms. McHugh stated that the concept is something to be considered. Mr. Cohen explained that the County

Executive offered this member balance ratio. Given that, if they are comfortable with that much board appointments, if the County has a COG plan the powers the Board of Supervisors has should still reside with the board continuity elements. Ms. Phan stated that this will be discussed with Supervisor McKay as well. She explained that this issue would be discussed during the meeting with Supervisor McKay.

Mr. Kirkpatrick expressed his concern that the County Executive in his normal role reports to the board, but in the PDRP, if the Board of Supervisors appoints themselves to the Recovery Policy Board, the Board of Supervisors reports to the County Executive. He expressed that this would create an odd situation. The group agreed that the circular reporting structure was a potential issue.

Mr. Cohen explained that the reporting structure, as it relates to the powers and membership of the Recovery Policy Board, had been discussed with the Board of Supervisors and the County Executive. The way the Recovery Policy Board is structured, with the option for the Board of Supervisors to self appoint, is supposed address some of the concerns regarding delegation of power. Examples of previous disaster, the elected officials were ex officio. There aren't many instances where elected officials actually served on this type of board.

Mr. Kirkpatrick asked if the Fairfax County public meetings law states if you have a certain number of Board of Supervisors members present a meeting announcement and advertising it to the public must be done. Mr. McKernan replied yes. Ms. Johnson noted that the Recovery Policy Board would be open to the public anyway.

Mr. Kirkpatrick expressed his concern regarding the fact that closed sessions don't produce the same dialogue as an open session. He asked the committee if they want the public attendees to dictate how the Recovery Policy Board meetings went.

Ms. McHugh agreed with Mr. Kirkpatrick's concern. She suggested language be inserted regarding the option and valid reason a closed session could take place.

Mr. Cohen suggested authorizing a closed session discussion but not allowing action to be taken during a closed session. Action would have to be taken in a public forum. Ms. McHugh agreed with this concept, but stated she would have to review the statutes regarding closed session meetings within the County.

Mr. McKernan asked if there was anything in this language that the committee wouldn't be comfortable going to Supervisor McKay.

Ron stated he was concerned, that if Board of Supervisors appoints themselves, it will be difficult to make the tough decisions in an open session. If you are looking for speedy recovery, dealing with issues in an open session won't help that. Ms. McHugh replied that the Board of Supervisors may not have a choice. She will look into the concept. Mr. McKernan reminded the committee that one of the major goals of this Recovery Policy Board is to maintain a transparent operation.

Ms. Johnson explained that if private entities and organizations are going to be involved in the recovery be concerned with what is happening to their buildings and when it will happen. She stated she can't imagine going into closed session for any of the recovery. That is not a normal practice in our transparent government. The planning commission doesn't do it.

Mr. Cohen explained the Recovery Coordinator and the County Executive will have to have political savvy. This will be added to the necessary skill sets for the Recovery Coordinator.

Mr. Cohen then provided the committee with an overview of the roles and responsibilities of the Recovery Policy Board Subcommittees. The point of the subcommittees is to address the number of entities, external to Fairfax County. The subcommittees are a way to bring those entities into the top of the organization for policy oversight. The subcommittees are established as the discretion of the Recovery Policy Board. They will serve as a forum for coordination of regional and inter-jurisdictional policy. Each subcommittee chair will be a member of the Recovery Policy Board. Members of the subcommittee may include those outside of Fairfax County including VDOT, military installations, etc.

Ms. McHugh noted that prior language states the Recovery Policy Board represents the County exclusively, but it can form Sub-committees which are doing regional work, which is confusing. Mr. Cohen suggested that the term Sub-committees be modified to address this issue. Ms. McHugh stated that if the sub-committee is reporting to the Recovery Policy Board regarding regional issues, then the Recovery Policy Board is not compliant with the Fairfax County restriction.

Ms. Johnson explained the planning commission has sub-committees, but there are no outside members. They ask the audience to comment, but the members are people from the planning commission. The usually solicit feedback from the audience regarding issues.

Mr. McKernan asked how Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT), a huge component, would be plugged into the process otherwise.

Ms. Johnson suggested VDOT be included in the process through Fairfax Department of Transportation (DOT) liaison. DOT works with VDOT to come up with a group and they have standards set up. Eric Teitelman, DOT, explained VDOT has a person appointed as part of the region that is a liaison with the County and the cities within the region. The Board of Supervisors has a Board of Transportation Committee, which consists of the entire Board of Supervisors. VDOT attends those meetings. Mr. McKernan asked how VDOT would be included in decision making affecting not only the County but other jurisdictions and sectors.

If the Board of Supervisors chooses to have themselves on the Recovery Policy Board, their influence over entities such as Metropolitan Airport Authority will be greater than if community members were appointed. The reason VDOT is involved with the Board of Supervisors is because a bill was passed on the State level.

Mr. Kirkpatrick explained that if something happened such as the Springfield interchange is taken out, VDOT will be in communication with the County Executive immediately. That is where the dialogue will start. Mr. McKernan asked if Advisory Groups would be a better term.

Ms. Johnson expressed her thought that the term sub-committees is fine. She stated that there is so much information that can be discussed; it will depend on the situation. You may want a sub-committee that can focus on the day to day issues of certain areas.

Ms. McHugh stated what is described in the PDRP language can be done in a way it can be designed where the groups consider regional issues. She asked that concept would square with what stated previously regarding the Recovery Policy Board focusing exclusively on Fairfax County. Mr. Cohen explained the intent is that the Recovery Policy Board may want to make determinations regarding housing in a certain areas, which is a Fairfax County issue, in light of what utilities will come back

first, which isn't a Fairfax County issue. Ms. Johnson suggested inserting language stating the sub-committees it may or can function as forums.

Ms. McHugh suggested the sentence stating the exclusive focus on Fairfax County should be revised to include some type of consideration for the region. Mr. Cohn agreed with the suggestion.

Mr. Cohen provided the committee with an explanation of the remaining timeline for the PDRP Development project. The core plan is expected to be complete in September. The annexes and appendices of the plan will be ready the following month. It will be available for comment through the end of the year. The plan for the table top will be ready in the beginning of 2012.

Mr. Barberie asked how the public review and comments will occur. Ms. Phan explained the County has new Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for the County's process for having plans reviewed for comments and finalized, which has yet to be implemented. Mr. Cohen explained that the process will be conducted in the same way it is done for a Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Mr. Cohen then explained the remaining items in the calendar including the Table top exercise and PDRP Summit.

E. Discuss PDRP Table Top Exercise (TTX)

Mike, Fairfax OEM, explained the exercise schedule for the next few months. He provided a description of how the upcoming functional exercise will incorporate the PDRP. There will be field exercises on days 1 and 2. On day 3, the PDRP group will be brought together and have a table-top exercise and train on the PDRP.

F. Wrap up

Ms. Phan then announced the PDRP Summit. She stated the purpose of the summit and what is expected in regards to involvement from Steering Committee Meeting members. She also provided an overview of the agenda and breakout sessions. Ms. Holman announced to all members the need for co-facilitators and the expectations of that role.

Mr. McKernan assured the group that if they volunteer to participate as co-facilitators, they will be there for the PDRP briefing and aren't going to be put on the spot. He stated the goal is to gradually have the participants understand the gradual move from response to recovery. If you come to sit on the committee, you won't be making life and death decisions. We should determine the issues that we see for this particular event.

Ms. Phan stated part of the reason for the summit in September, is to identify who will play the roles in recovery for the agencies. She explained that OEM hopes to have the review of the PDRP finalized the end of December or January so it can be ready for the exercise. Mr. McKernan reminded the group that time should be built in for the Board of Supervisors to review it as well. Ms. McHugh suggested an additional agenda item for the meeting with Supervisor McKay, to identify when the Board of Supervisors review will take place.

Ms. Phan explained that Supervisor McKay provided some guidance on that issue. She explained to the group that the PDRP review and endorsement process wouldn't be the same process as the EOP, because the PDRP isn't federally mandated. The PDRP will probably be submitted to the Board of Supervisors as an informational review item. She will make sure all committee members are aware

of that process when it is finalized. All members will receive a copy of the PDRP brochures, which provide information about the PDRP effort and the partnerships formed with the Non-profit and private sector.

Ms. Phan asked for additional questions. No members had questions and the meeting was adjourned.